DEPARTMENT • OF • WATER • RESOURCES
CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN
UPDATE 2005

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
LOS ANGELES, CA

Date:	***June 22, 2005*** 1:00-5:00 pm	*Location:*	***Los Angeles*** Metropolitan Water District of Southern California 700 North Alameda Street
Meeting Purpose and Goals:	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm			

Presenters:
Martha Davis, Advisory Committee member, Inland Empire Utilities District
Nick Di Croce, Advisory Committee member, California Trout
Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Julia Lee, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento
Mark Stuart, District Chief, Southern District, DWR

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Julia Lee, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop. She thanked Tim Worley of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA for making the meeting facility available. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Nick Di Croce and Martha Davis spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Southern District Chief Mark Stuart gave a presentation on the South Coast Regional Report, which is located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For a detailed description of the format, see the "Working in Groups" handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B
A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the content and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee members Nick Di Croce and Martha Davis explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Table 1: + Liked the scenarios, very forward thinking, enhanced strategic planning process. + Liked water use efficiency. + Integrated regional planning is an important approach. + Liked global climate incorporation. **Table 2:** No comments. **Table 3:** + Implement all 3 phases. + Excellent progress, good approach. + Inclusion of a broad/diverse Advisory Committee led to better strategies. + Felt that the process is balanced. + Good input by the Advisory Committee. **Table 4:** + Impressed with the Implementation Plan. + Liked the scenarios. + High marks for including water quality. + High marks for the full systems approach, linking water quality and supply. + Liked integrated water management, especially at the regional level. + Liked DWR staff; efforts are sincere. **Individual Comment Forms:** + Extensive public input from the	**Table 1:** Δ More information in funding scenarios and phasing. Δ Would like to see enhancement on relationships between water and energy conservation. Δ Would like to see how general public sees the state planning over 25 years. Δ Optimize operations of the State Water Project, the Central Valley Project, and other major infrastructure as recommendations in the Water Plan. o Integrated water quality, storage, and supply Δ The State should take over Central Valley Project operations and have a stronger plan for integrating all agencies. Δ Flood management in urban areas is an important opportunity. **Table 2:** Δ In order to have economic feasibility, you need to add supply reliability as a block in the Framework for Action. Δ In Framework for Action, rename "water use efficiency" to "conservation." Δ A statewide surface and subsurface storage study is needed. o Groundwater overdraft needs reiteration	**Table 1:** • Why is public trust under the environment? • How does the state see the customer segments; what does it look like, what does the industrial sector look like in 25 years? **Table 2:** • Will disagreements among the Advisory Committee be discussed in the Water Plan? • Concern: document looks at things over which the state doesn't have control; the state should have more control over major supplies to affect policy. **Table 3:** No comments. **Table 4:** • No apparent way of getting feedback; how do we know if our statements about this have been heard? • Should we rely on the Delta when it is in trouble? • Conflict between Delta water quality for people and for fish. • When is the next Water Plan due for release, based on the phase approach? • Water bags – suggested that DWR see written report submitted (by Terry Sprague). • How will regions from different basins interact? • What does "regional integration" mean?

ground floor up!
+ Presentation well done.
+ Liked integrated approach.
+ Liked linking water quality, supply, and habitat/watershed functions.

elsewhere than Bulletin 118.
  - Look to regional distribution.
  - Link to water quality

Δ State should take the lead in optimizing water projects in order to improve efficiency, water quality, deliver highest quality of water;
Δ State ought to take over operations of CVP to have integrated statewide approach.

Table 3:

Δ Seek more input from nonprofit organizations.
Δ Fell short of allowing capacity for grassroots groups to participate because of length and funding of process (meetings out of town).

Table 4:

Δ Wanted more in the Implementation Plan.
Δ Water Plan should focus more on water conservation.
Δ Would like more priorities identified.

Individual Comment Forms:

Δ Need storage of precipitation runoff.
Δ Need more emphasis on conservation.
Δ Add a third Initiative called "Conservation" for the Framework for Action. It should be front and center.
Δ Don't just call out tribes as government entities – city and county governments need to be included in this bullet. Malibu is as big if not a bigger challenge than tribal governments.
Δ Ecosystem restoration must be one of the 15, not 14 recommendations.
Δ Add more discussion of low impact development.
Δ More integration of water and energy conservation.

Individual Comment Forms:

- How do we deal with conflict between DWR, CA Department of Health Services, CA Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards in the use of storm water, recycled water, and restoration waters for several different uses?

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D
C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and accomplishments. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called "California Water Today." As the largest chapter in Volume 1, it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented slides on California Water Today and statewide water balances, and Southern District Chief Mark Stewart summarized the Volume 3 regional report for the South Coast.

Below is a summary of comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Table 1: + Liked integrated regional planning – going in the right direction. + Like the way the Water Plan is broken down into hydrologic regions, but would prefer using subregions (Metropolitan areas, Santa Ana Watershed Planning Area, etc.). **Table 3:** + Layout of report is good. + Liked diverse statewide issues. **Individual Comment Forms:** + Liked regional approach.	**Table 1:** Δ We would like to look at things by region in the Water Plan; break up the South Coast into regional borders. Δ Need to use urban water management plans. Δ Verify the bar chart of use and supply – recycled water shows more in wet years **Table 2:** Δ Challenge the assumptions that population will increase; describe population of infill and migration. Δ Chart is not complete – use and supplies. Δ Evapotranspiration applied water for agriculture is needed. Δ Water relations with Mexico should be addressed. Δ Water Flow Diagram unclear; use terms that decision makers would understand. **Table 3:** Δ Add funding inputs into the scenarios processes. Δ Need to address agricultural	**Table 1:** • Concern: need improved communication between subregions • Concern: Need to improve the integration and use of available data. **Table 2:** • How do we measure achievement of goals? • Concern: "If you don't use it, you lose it." Water rights are an issue for conservation in agriculture. **Table 3:** • Does the Water Plan address how to mitigate groundwater problems? • Does the Water Plan address metering and pricing issues? **Table 4:** • How do you account for conservation, groundwater recharge, and stormwater? • How do you relate land use and fiscal policies? • Most of the data in the regional reports are anecdotal.

	water use efficiency vs. water supply rights. Δ For South Coast region, discuss factors other than population – land development and urban sprawl. Δ For Agricultural water use efficiency, need to discuss metering issues and cost issues. Δ Address implications of state water policy to people in Mexico. Δ Address impacts to the environment. Δ Local challenges – add storrmwater management as a strategy. Δ Discuss technology advances in agricultural hardware. Δ Study impervious surface vs. pervious surface impacts to percolation. **Table 4:** Δ Need more information to make decisions on a regional basis. **Individual Comment Forms:** Δ Incorporate the Pacific Institute Report due out at the end of June. Δ Need feedback from within the regional water agencies about actual water use. Δ Need more emphasis on conservation and recycling as a block of the Water Plan. Δ The Water Plan needs more emphasis of land use related to water availability. Δ Water transfers should only happen based on conservation policies completed prior to transfers. Δ Emphasize urban conservation. Δ Make more clear actual water usage vs. applied water usage. Δ Need better explanation on graphs for "John Q. Public" to understand. Δ Add more statewide challenges	• Need information from urban water management plans (that won't be finished before the end of the year) to know how many agencies are planning to reduce imported water supplies. • Need information from small districts to integrate with major entities. **Individual Comment Forms:** • How does the Water Plan address precipitation runoff statements (not specifically Southern CA)? • How stable is the aging water delivery infrastructure? **Individual Comment Forms:** • Why was less water reused in the dry year (2001 Water Balance)? • What is the basis for water reuse? • How does the Water Plan account for conservation, recycling, reclamation, and stormwater use? • What is "applied water"?

	– salmon/steelhead and wildlife/T&E species need to be called out as a challenge. Δ Regional challenge – future development, impervious surfaces, urban runoff, NEMO. Δ Add information on how Southern CA agencies plan to reduce reliance on expected water. Δ Add information on the connection between land use decisions and water supply and reliability.	

Question & Answer Segment:

Q: What is background conservation?
A: Currently there are water agencies that have invested in active water conservation, yet other businesses, through their decisions, can conserve water. For background conservation, farmers do conservation not because of active programs but because it makes business sense.

Q: So, would this include the plumbing code?
A: Yes, it is "behind the scenes" conservation.

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F
E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use and supplies between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of several plausible yet different future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course of events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all regions of the state. Each region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows water planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2: Resource Management Strategies has narrative descriptions of 25 different strategies available to water managers to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Table 1: + Liked having multiple scenarios – well discussed.	**Table 1:** Δ Would like to see scenarios built up from local to regional levels. Δ Make a decision on one scenario – multiple creates confusion. **Table 3:** Δ Must consider watershed management as a strategy (runoff) – should be a positive objective. **Table 4:** Δ Need an audit of groundwater deficit assumptions. Δ Need an assumption that the Delta ecosystem will crash. Δ Need more detailed cost information for elements of future strategies. Δ Need a more sophisticated model that will address the environment, water quality, ecosystem, and environmental justice… **Individual Comment Forms:** Δ Recommend more conservation requirements in urban areas, i.e. golf courses, schools, parks, etc. Δ Recommend against allowing quality agricultural land to be changed to urban. Δ Get tribal governments to contribute to funding of state water systems. Δ Recommend better ways to use precipitation runoff.	**Table 1:** • What framework and assumptions were used for the scenarios? • Can the methodology be used for smaller areas? • How much flexibility does the framework have? • What is DWR's vision how the framework will be implemented at the regional and local levels? • How does this work across boundaries? **Table 2:** • The Tulare Hydrologic Region is an interesting case – all scenarios show declines in water use in this region. • Central Valley water use will not decline as agriculture changes to urban. • Water reuse is a difficult concept to quantify for the future (the bar chart doesn't satisfy everyone). • Concern: There will eventually be a food shortage. • Concern: In Kern, Tulare, Fresno, and Merced, farms that aren't making money are replaced with houses. • Concern: Are we encouraging suburban sprawl in agricultural lands? • Concern that water reuse may be undercounted in the Water Plan. • Concern: Desalination seems like an endless supply but need to consider cost component. Reclamation cannot meet TDS standards, so we lose the amount of reclaimable water. • Desalination is not a panacea. • Think about long term sustainability when managing

		the environment; may need to reprioritize how environmental water is used. **Table 3:** • Are salmon and steelhead issues addressed in the South Coast Regional Report? • What were the assumptions in the scenarios? • Conservation potential was positive, but can it be achieved? **Table 4:** • Need to standardize data within and between regions • Need to organize regional stakeholder groups ASAP. • How does the Water Plan measure and account for environmental justice? • How do we balance the needs among fish, water quality, environmental justice, urban, agriculture, and the environment?

Part 4 Additional Public Comments

- Length of time and amount of work were barriers to the process.
- Concern that many people wanted to learn about the Water Plan; not ready to talk about details at the public workshops.
- Concerned about timing of Water Plan Updates. Urban Water Management Plans are released on years 5 and 10, and the CA Water Plan Updates have been traditionally released in between those years. This makes it hard to for these different plans to fully take advantage each other's data.
- Incorporate the Pacific Institute's new water report due out in June.
- Computer model (CalSim II) needs to be revised to include conservation, environmental requirements, water quality standards and constraints against water deliveries.

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. Three members of the public were registered for speaker comments:

Jim Steward, Best Technology Company

Mr. Steward spoke to promote a technology called "Free Flow." This technology uses physics that extracts dissolved calcium out of water as microcrystals. That prevents scale on drip lines and hardpan in the soil, resulting in greater porosity and water flow to roots. It is an alternative to acid treatments. He stated that there have been a number of documented studies that show that this technology

promotes better quality crops for about 20% less water. Mr. Steward stated that if "Free Flow" technology is used throughout California, it could save an estimated 6 million acre feet per year for agriculture.

David Nesmith, Environmental Water Caucus:

Mr. Nesmith called attention to a leaflet that he had brought to the meeting. He mentioned that he had told DWR that this is a good plan for several reasons. Mr. Nesmith stated that water from the Delta is unreliable; in the last 4 years the Delta ecosystem has shown signs of major collapse. The South Delta Improvement Project could also be called the "South Delta increased pumping project." He asked people to direct their attentions and efforts to more reliable regional water supply alternatives. Otherwise, the Delta system will be come less and less reliable for the rest of the state.

Mr. Nesmith submitted a written leaflet, which is posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm

Terry Spragg, Terry G. Spragg & Associates

Mr. Spragg presented what he called "world's strongest zipper," which he said could be used to haul water up and down the California coast as an alternative conveyance route to bypass the Delta. If an earthquake occurred on the Hayward fault, there is no major plan for alternative water deliveries. With these zippers, water bags could be filled at Sacramento Harbor and shipped down to Southern California. Mr. Sprague stated that Curt Schmutte, Chief of Delta Levees, North Branch, DWR, has a plan and the economics are well defined.

Mr. Spragg submitted written comments, which are posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Inna Babbitt, City of Pasadena Water & Power
Sonja Bartsch, League of Women Voters (Pasadena)
Mark Beuhler, Coachella Valley Water District
Kirk Brewer, California Water Association / Southern California Water Company
Alyce Brookfield, Occidental College
Kathy Caldwell, CH2M Hill

Bob Campbell, Public
David Cordero, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Martha Davis, Inland Empire Utilities District
Nick Di Croce, California Trout
Michael Durand, University of California, Los Angeles
Joan Dym, Southern California Water Committee
Conner Everts, POWER
Brandon Goshi, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Jill Gravender, Environment Now
Allen Gribneu, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Dan Griset, Southern California Association of Governments
Greg Gunther, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project
Sondra Hauge, League of Women Voters (Pasadena)
Ted Having, Eastern Municipal Water District
Philip Huffeldt, Occidental College
Jagjit Kaur, CH2M Hill
Francie Kennedy, City of San Juan Capistrano
John Kilkeary, PM Consultants
Mary Lou Cotton, Castaic Lake Water Agency
Jay Malinowksi, MPI
David Nesmith, Environmental Water Caucus
David O'Donnell, TreePeople
Christopher Patton, City of Los Angeles
Lynne Plambeck, SCOPE
Jane Raftis, City of Pasadena Water & Power
Justin M. Scott-Coe, Integrated Resource Management, LLC
John Slezch, Public
Michael Sonnen, Construction Engineer
Terry Spragg, Terry G. Spragg & Associates
Samantha Stevens, Environment Now
Jim Stewart, Best Technology Company
Peer Swan, Irvine Ranch Water District
Jeffery Szytel, HDR
Gene Talmadge, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
Rich Whetsel, Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Tim Worley, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Deb Whitney, Eastern Municipal Water District
Damien Young, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Staff:

Glenn Berquist, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Robert Fastenau, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
David Inouye, DWR
Linda Inouye, DWR

Vern Knoop, DWR
Julia Lee, CCP
Mark Stuart, DWR
David Sumi, CCP